



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

evidently a hard worker and thoroughly in love with his subject, as shown by the publication of this book at his own expense, — no slight undertaking. Yet his book is almost valueless beyond calling attention to an interesting field of investigation. A theory has evidently been preconceived, and then all the scattered facts have been collected with much labor and fitted in to suit this theory, or, more properly, this speculation. The arguments are terribly illogical, and the gaps jumped over to reach conclusions are distressingly wide, M. Gravier needs a course of German reading in order to learn method. Ability is not wanting in France any more than in England or America, but defective method has been the cause of much poor historical work, both French and English.

It is to be hoped that continued investigation and fresh discoveries may soon throw more light on the obscure history of the great building races which once peopled both the southern and northern portions of the American continent. The roving visits of piratical Norsemen form a small point in our history; but some knowledge of the race now extinct, which once peopled this country and possessed so much civilization and intelligence, would be invaluable.

-
2. — *A. Schwegler's Römische Geschichte.* Fortgeführt von OCTAVIUS CLASON. Vierter Band [der Fortsetzung Erster Band], vom Gallischen Brande Roms bis zum ersten Samniter-Kriege. Berlin: Verlag von S. Calvary & Co. 1873. 8vo. pp. xxviii and 428.

PROFESSOR SCHWEGLER, of the University of Tübingen, author of the well-known History of Philosophy, died in 1857, leaving unfinished a history of Rome of great and peculiar merit. Its author was not a specialist in Roman history, in the sense in which Mommsen, Peter, Ihne, and Lange are specialists; but possessing a wide learning, a remarkable power of combination and analysis, and a clear, calm judgment, his plan was to produce a work which should be an encyclopædia of its subject, bringing together all the facts and all the leading theories in regard to it, and weighing the theories with the impartiality of one who was himself no theorist. Such a work must necessarily be on an enormous scale, and no wonder its author died with his task scarcely begun. He left three thick volumes, reaching to the threshold of authentic history, the capture of Rome by the Gauls. What dimensions his work would have attained, could he have lived to complete it, it is impossible to conjecture. It is, at all events, a matter of congratulation that his clear eye and steady hand can guide

the inquirer through the mazes of that period where such a help is most needed ; and it has not seemed at all likely that any one would be found to continue the gigantic undertaking.

A continuation has nevertheless been undertaken, and its first volume, on about the scale of Schwegler's original work, lies before us. It possesses certainly sufficient merit of its own to entitle it to a welcome from all interested in Roman history ; the question is, How far does its author succeed in doing the work which his predecessor began ? Here we will indicate three principal points of difference between them. In the first place, Dr. Clason lacks the remarkable perspicuity of style which characterized Professor Schwegler ; one not infrequently finds it hard to guess precisely what he means to say. In the second place, where the original work gave full citations, the continuation gives nothing but bare references. This may not necessarily be a defect. Certainly it reduces the bulk very materially, and that is a consideration of some weight, in so extensive a work. It does, however, completely change the character of the treatise. The first three volumes are by themselves sufficient for the student ; the passages from ancient writers are quoted with such fulness, as proof or illustration of statements in the text, that the student rarely has occasion to go to the original authority to test a point. The book is a library by itself ; and, if we could conceive of such a case, a person taking a sea-voyage, or camping out in the Adirondacks, might if he chose make a thorough *study* of early Roman history from just these three volumes. Now, the new volume would be far from serving the same end ; the student must have his Livy, Dionysius, and Cicero, nay, his Aulus Gellius, Festus, and Siculus Flaccus, in short, every author referred to, if he wishes to follow up special points of inquiry.

A third point of difference is in regard to the general view taken of Roman history. Schwegler was, as we have remarked, under the dominion of no theory. In general he was a disciple of Niebuhr, and the chief defect of his treatment is his incapacity to do justice to later writers of original genius, — Huschke, Rubino, and Mommsen, — as compared with the more special followers of Niebuhr, — Götting, Becker, and Lange. Belonging to the Tübingen school, he carries to an extreme the sceptical method of interpreting the ancient records ; in both respects, as a follower of Niebuhr, and a thinker of "advanced" views, he is an ardent advocate of the plebs as against the patricians. Now this is not having a theory ; it is simply accepting the prevailing theory, which happened to coincide with his own mental tendencies.

Here Dr. Clason takes issue with him. Accepting the recent results of K. W. Nitzsch (*Römische Annalistik*), — one of the most impor-

tant of which is that our chief authority for the early history is not the records of the [Patrician] College of Pontifices, but of the Plebeian *Ædiles*, preserved in the temple of Ceres, and that these records present a one-sided plebeian view of the early struggles, — he is disposed to vindicate the patricians, where we are in the custom of taking sides exclusively with the plebeians. He disclaims every idea of doing this as a partisan. We are accustomed, he says, to look only at one side ; but the other side has something to be said for it as well. The two orders were, he says, “two competing elements with equal rights, whose struggle and conflict must, to be sure, necessarily advance the plebeian rights, but at the same time, as a retarding force against the plebeian claims, did the state a great service, and in a high degree aided in strengthening its position.” (*Vorrede*, p. xv.) These two elements he happily characterizes (p. 26) as “one which has received a natural development, and one which is receiving a natural development (den natürlich gewordenen und den natürlich werdenden).”

This is a correct and instructive view, so far as it goes ; we need to be reminded that “the right of authority and tradition is also a natural right developed out of relations imposed by nature, not an artificial and forcibly established one.” (p. 26.) This point needs, however, a little further analysis. We know very well that, as a matter of fact, present “authority and tradition” — say American slavery, English land monopoly, the Turkish rule in Constantinople — are artificial creations of force and injustice. How did the prerogatives of the Roman patricians differ in this respect ? Because, as has been pointed out, the Roman patriciate was formed by a natural development. It is not, then, universally true that authority and tradition possess a natural right ; it is true only when, as in this case, it has been developed by a natural process.

But the struggle in this case was deeper than merely between a system which had been developed by a natural process, and one which was in process of development ; it was between a mature and developed organism and a destructive, disorganizing force. The movement which overthrew the political supremacy of the patricians was typical of the great movement to which society in its entire career has been subjected, — the substitution of individualism for organism. The most fundamental principle established in the domain of primitive institutions by the investigations of Bastian, Maine, Lubbock, Morgan, and others of the present generation, is the highly organized character of the earliest institutions, as outgrowths of the family ; the individual being completely merged in the organization. The history of society has consisted essentially in a gradual disintegration of these organisms,

which has resulted in placing the individual man as its unit in their stead. It was then with the clear-sightedness of genius that Calhoun struck at the vital feature of modern democracy, in urging the claims of political organisms against numerical majorities ; and it was with no mere dull conservatism that men of masculine intellect, like Lord Eldon, clung to the rotten-borough system, as being, in their eyes, a part of an organic whole ; strike out that abuse, and the whole system will go, — as has turned out to be the case.

Now the Roman patriciate was a body which had been formed by a natural process of organic growth ; the plebs was no organism at all, but an unorganized mass. It contained, it is true, organic elements, in the rural plebs, and to a certain extent in the clients ; it had formed itself into an independent organization within the state, but this organization was artificially created, not naturally developed. The plebeian families copied the gentile institution of the patricians (which some of them no doubt possessed from the first) ; and they formed the Italian custom of auspices into a system analogous to that which was under the charge of the College of Augurs ; for all this, it was with no mere high-born arrogance that the patricians denied to the plebeians the possession of both gens and auspices. No doubt the force which overthrew the patrician predominance was an irresistible one ; no doubt too any further maintenance of this predominance would have been equally unwise and unjust. We do not say that the benefits of the disintegration do not far outweigh its evils ; nevertheless it is at best a destructive process, and the patricians were perfectly right, from their point of view, in resisting a reform that subverted the very foundations of their political system.

We have not space to enter into the detailed examination of Dr. Clason's book. Its importance consists, as we have shown, not so much in these as in the fact that it looks at the early history of Rome from a new point of view. As a continuation of Schwegler's great work we cannot regard it as a success, for the reason that it does not do the same special service for students ; as an original and interesting treatment of its subject, it deserves attention and consideration.

-
3. — *La Démocratie en France au Moyen Age.* Par F. T. PERRENS. Ouvrage Couronné par l'Institut. (Académie des sciences morales et politiques.) Paris. Librairie Académique. Didier et C^{ie}, Libraires-Éditeurs. 35 Quai des Augustins. 2 vols. 8vo.

To the student of political history there are few periods more interesting than the fourteenth century. Although reckoned as belonging